Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/068,556	KODAMA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Holly Rickman	1773
All Participants: Status of Application:		
(1) <u>Holly_Rickman</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Laura Wanek</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 29 November 2004	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: none		
Claims discussed: claim 8		
Prior art documents discussed: none	,	
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet		
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. T of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summation 	he examiner will provide a writt e record of the substance of the	ten summary of the substance interview, since the interview
1) //.t.		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Application	nt/Applicant's Representative S	ignature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Exr indicated that upon review of the prior art, claim 8 was not allowable as previously indicated. The Exr noted that the prior art teaches the use of adhesion improving underlayers it would have been obvious to add such a layer to the structure taught by Takahashi et al. It was noted that all other claims were in condition for allowance. Ms. Wanek agreed to the cancellation of claim 8 in order to put the case in condition for allowance.

HOLLY PICKMAN DOMARY EXAMINER